REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3 and 4 have been incorporated in claim 1. In addition, claims 17 and 18 have been incorporated into claim 16 and claims 24 and 25 have been incorporated into claim 22. The Examiner's rejection is traversed below.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Bhatt et al.* teaches: "multicasting the message to the selected ones of the plurality of e-business entities based upon the determining by the broker, such that the first entity is not required to know any one of the plurality of enterprise computer system protocols" (Final Office Action, page 5, citing Col. 11, lines 56-66 of *Bhatt et al.*).

The pertinent section of *Bhatt et al.* is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience:

> In the embodiment, before incoming messages are delivered to a subscriber, it is determined if the subscriber qualifies to receive any incoming message more than once. If it is determined that the subscriber does qualify to receive a given incoming message more than once, then that incoming message is delivered to the subscriber only once.
> In the embodiment, the messages that are delivered to subscribers who are qualified to receive them include not only incoming messages but also messages that have been published at an earlier time and that were stored in the database. [*Bhatt et al.*, Col. 11, lines 56-66]

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that *Bhatt et al.* does NOT teach <u>multicasting the message such that the first entity is not required to know any one of the plurality of enterprise computing system protocols</u>.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Bhatt et al.* nor *Mandler et al.* teach or suggest: (a) publishing the response to the service interface based upon the determining of the selected ones of a first plurality of e-business entities to receive the message by the broker, (b) publishing the response to the broker by a service interface, and (c) publishing the response to the first e-business entity by the broker (Claim 1).

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Mandler et al.* teaches all of these features noted above (a, b and c). (Final Office Action, page 7, citing Col. 4, lines 29-31 of *Bhatt et al.*).

The pertinent section of *Mandler et al.* is reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience:

The broker then receives price quotes from sellers responding to the request and transmits the quotes to the buyer. [Col. 4, lines 29-31 of *Mandler et al.*]

Clearly, *Mandler et al.* does NOT teach these features. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over *Mandler et al.* and *Bhatt et al.* for at least these reason.

Still further, it is respectfully submitted that neither *Mandler et al.* nor *Bhatt et al.* teach or suggest receiving the message through a multicast protocol at each of the selected ones of a plurality of e-business entities, reviewing the message at each of the selected ones of the plurality of e-business entities, and determining if a response to the message is to be generated at each of the plurality of e-business entities based upon the reviewing (Claim 1).

Other independent claims recite similar features and are therefore patentable over *Mandler et al.* and *Bhatt et al.* for at least the same reasons.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. SUN1P817). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

October 6, 2006
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300